



MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP  
300 S. WACKER DRIVE  
32ND FLOOR  
CHICAGO IL 60606

**COPY MAILED**

MAR 05 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Andrew Welcher et al.  
Application No. 11/200,389  
Filed: August 8, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 99-372-F1

: DECISION ON PETITION  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
: and  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
:

This is a decision on the petition filed December 23, 2008, under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of prior-filed non-provisional applications 09/927,850 filed August 10, 2001 and 09/724,860 filed November 8, 2000, and under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed provisional application 60/8169,720 filed December 8, 1999, which are set forth in the amendment filed with the petition.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition does not satisfy item (1) above.

There does not appear to be copendency between the present application and application no. 09/927,850. A final Office Action was mailed July 6, 2004. In response a Notice of Appeal was filed January 6, 2005 with a three month extension of time, to which an Appeal Brief was due by March 6, 2005 or with a five month extension of time, could have been filed August 6, 2005. A request for an extension of time was not made in the 09/927,850 application. Thus, the '850 application became abandoned as of midnight August 6, 2005 and was not active when the present application was filed August 8, 2005. It is suggested that petitioners file a petition for revival in the '850 application for the purposes establishing copendency with the present application. This is provided that the '850 application was not intentionally abandoned by applicant.

Further, the reference to add the prior-filed application on page one following the first sentence of the specification is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed application. An incorporation by reference statement added after an application's filing date is not effective because no new matter can be added to an application after its filing date (see 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)). If an incorporation by reference statement is included in an amendment to the specification to add a benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 after the filing date of the application, the amendment would not be proper. When a benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 is submitted after the filing of an application, the reference to the prior application cannot include an incorporation by reference statement of the prior application. See Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980). Note MPEP §§ 201.06(c) and 608.04(b).

The specification provided on filing did not incorporate by reference non-provisional applications 09/927,850 and 09/724,860 as well as 60/169,720 as does the amendment filed with the instant petition.

Finally, the amendment as drafted is unacceptable and, therefore, is not considered a proper reference under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i). In this regard, the priority claim is not in the proper form and must be in an amendment, not physically part of any other document as the response and, as such, does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). Note that 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with § 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority), must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Before the petition under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a renewed petition and either a Supplemental Application Data Sheet (signed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.33(b) and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.76) or a substitute amendment (complying with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121) to correct the above matters are required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                   Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                              Commissioner for Patents  
                              Post Office Box 1450  
                              Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                 Customer Service Window  
                              Mail Stop Petitions  
                              Randolph Building  
                              401 Dulany Street  
                              Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                   (571) 273-8300  
                              ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212.

  
Anthony Knight  
Supervisor  
Office of Petitions